

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-32, 34-38, and 40-43 are pending in this application. In the Office Action mailed October 5, 2005 ("OA")¹, the Examiner rejected claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,627,996 to *Bauer*; rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 11, 12, 15-22, 24-26, 29-32, 34-36, and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,237 to *Kyne et al.* ("*Kyne*"); and rejected claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,261 to *Shandony*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,246 to *Hagersten et al.* ("*Hagersten*"). However, in rejecting claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38, the Examiner relied upon the rejection of claim 4 (OA pg. 16). Because the Examiner rejected claims 4 as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of *Kyne*, Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38 in light of *Bauer*, *Kyne*, and *Hagersten*.

By this amendment, Applicants cancel claim 39 and amend claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 18, 19, 25, 26, 29, 35, 36, and 40-42. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-32, 34-38 and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Section 101 and 102(e) Rejections of Claim 39

By this amendment, Applicants cancel claim 39. As such, the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is moot.

Rejections of Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-32, 34-38, and 40-43

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 11, 12, 15-22, 24-26, 29-32, 34-36, and 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of *Kyne*. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, the prior art reference as modified must teach or suggest all the claim elements. (See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (8th ed. 2001)). Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine the reference teachings. (See M.P.E.P. § 2143 (8th ed. 2001)). Third a reasonable expectation of success must exist. Moreover, each of these requirement must “be found in the prior art, and not be based on applicant’s disclosure.” (M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (8th ed. 2001)).

Claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that amended claim 1 recites, for example, “substituting the expandable sequence by at least one identifier identifying the requesting node, wherein the requesting node comprises a process.”

In contrast, *Bauer* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Bauer* discloses a computer-based file system that enables user access to previously-stored data files, each file being identified by at least two file names formatted using different file name formats (*Bauer* abstract). *Bauer* further discloses

appending file names to a path name (*Bauer* fig. 3; col. 5, ll. 9-21). Moreover, depending on the operating system prefix/suffix, the system in *Bauer* computes an alternate file name using a designated algorithm and determines whether the computed alternate file name matches a base name (*Bauer* figs. 5-7; col. 10, ll. 2-8; col. 10, ll. 28-66). Therefore, *Bauer* teaches computing an alternate file name based on an operating system prefix/suffix provided by the requestor. However, *Bauer* does not teach or suggest "substituting the expandable sequence by at least one identifier identifying the requesting node, wherein the requesting node comprises a process," as recited in amended claim 1.

Independent claims 11, 18, 19, 29, and 40-42 include similar recitations. Accordingly, applicants submit that the rejections of claims 11, 18, 19, 29, and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are not supported by the cited art, for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 12, 15-17, 20-22, 24-26, 30-32, 34-36, and 43 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with regard to their respective allowable base claims. Moreover, Applicants submit that the cited art does not support the rejection of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of *Shandony* and further in view of *Hagersten*. However, in rejecting claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38, the Examiner relied upon the rejection of claim 4 (OA pg. 16). Because the Examiner rejected claims 4 as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of *Kyne*, Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38 in light of *Bauer*, *Kyne*, and *Hagersten*.

Claims 9-10, 13-14, 27-28, and 37-38 are dependent claims depending on independent claims 1, 11, 19, and 29, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that *Hagersten* is not sufficient to overcome the deficiencies of *Bauer* and *Kyne*. Specifically, *Hagersten*, alone or in combination with *Bauer* and *Kyne*, does not teach or suggest at least "substituting the expandable sequence by at least one identifier identifying the requesting node, wherein the requesting node comprises a process," as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that the cited art does not support the rejections of claims 9-10, 13-14, 27-28, and 37-38 for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to independent claims 1, 11, 19, and 29.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 5, 2006

By: 

Joshua C. Liu
Reg. No. 55,391